



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Japan or to any other nations any right in the overseas possessions of Germany save as an equal right therein should be secured to the United States. On the contrary, article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles provides:

"Germany renounces in favor of the principal allied and associated powers all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions."

It will not be questioned that one of the "principal allied and associated powers" in whose favor Germany renounces her rights and titles is the United States. Thus, not only could the position of the Government of Japan derive no strength from the Treaty of Versailles or from any discussions preliminary thereto, but the terms of that treaty confirm the position of the Government of the United States.

Further, the draft convention relating to the mandate for the German concessions in the Pacific Ocean north of the Equator, which was subsequently proposed, proceeded in the same view, purporting on behalf of the United States as one of the grantors to confer the mandate upon Japan, thus recognizing the right and interest of the United States and the fact that the proposed action could not be effective without the agreement of the United States as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

Denies Mandate's Validity

As the United States did not enter into this convention or into any treaty relating to the subject, this government is unable to understand upon what grounds it was thereafter attempted to confer the mandate without the agreement of the United States. It is manifest that the League of Nations was without any authority to bind the United States, and that the confirmation of the mandate in question and the definition of its terms by the Council of the League of Nations in December, 1920, cannot be regarded as having efficacy with respect to the United States.

It should be noted that this mandate not only recites article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles, to the effect that "Germany renounces in favor of the principal allied and associated powers all her rights over her overseas possessions, including therein the groups of islands in the Pacific Ocean lying north of the Equator," but also recites that "the principal allied and associated powers agreed that, in accordance with article 22, part 1 (covenant of the League of Nations), of the said treaty, a mandate should be conferred upon his Majesty the Emperor of Japan to administer the said islands and have proposed that the mandate should be formulated" as set forth. While this last-quoted recital, as has already been pointed out in previous communications by this government, is inaccurate in its terms, inasmuch as the United States as one of the principal allied and associated powers had not so agreed and proposed, the recital again recognizes the necessity of the participation of the United States in order to make the proposed disposition effective.

Then follows citation of the attitude taken by President Wilson during the process of negotiating the Versailles Treaty, when he stipulated that Yap should not be assigned to any one power, but be internationalized, following which citation Secretary Hughes proceeds to say:

Apart from the expressed purpose of President Wilson in relation to the island of Yap, inasmuch as the proceedings of the Supreme Council on May 7, 1919, did not, and in the nature of things could not, have finality, this government is unable to perceive any ground for the contention that it was the duty of this government to make immediate protest with respect to the so-called decision of May 7, 1919, and certainly it cannot be said that an omission to do so operated as a cession of its rights. It may be added, however, that, when the matter was brought to the attention of this government in connection with the conference on communications in October last, this government informed the Government of Japan and other governments (by notes of November 9, 19, 20) that it was the understanding of this government that the island of Yap was not included in the action of May 7, 1919. Its position was subsequently stated at length.

Reconsideration Expected

It is a cause of regret to this government that, after and despite this protest, there should have been any attempt to pass upon drafts of mandates purporting to deal with the Pacific islands, including Yap, and that a mandate should have been approved, or attempted to be put into effect, which, while purporting to be made in the name of the United States, was without the assent of the United States. This government trusts that this action, which it must assume was taken under a misapprehension, will be reconsidered.

In particular, as no treaty has ever been concluded with the United States relating to the island of Yap, and as no one has ever been authorized to cede or surrender the right or interest of the United States in the island, this government must insist that it has not lost its right or interest as it existed prior to any action of the Supreme Council or of the League of Nations, and cannot recognize the allocation of the island or the validity of the mandate to Japan.

In this view, this government deems it to be unnecessary at this time to consider the terms of the so-called "C" mandates or the discussion with respect thereto.

This government, as has been clearly stated in previous communications, seeks no exclusive interest in the island of Yap and has no desire to secure any privileges without having similar privileges accorded to other powers, including, of course, Japan, and, relying upon the sense of justice of the Government of Japan and of the governments of the other allied and associated powers, this government looks with confidence to a disposition of the matter whereby the just interests of all may be properly conserved.

THE UNITED STATES AND DISARMAMENT

Society of Friends Acts—Women Organizing

On March 23 a committee of the Society of Friends of Philadelphia waited on President Harding and presented a formal letter of good will toward him as an official and also urging him to consider seriously the problem of disarmament. Their communication said:

We are thankful for any steps the Administration may take toward disarmament; the time is ripe for the United States to take the lead in that direction, and we hold that the continuance of military preparations is nothing less than a challenge to our neighbors everywhere, and helps to create the very danger which it seeks to guard against. The history of Europe in the last fifty years confirms us in this belief. It will take courage to lead the way, but it will be the venture of a faith to which our nation must rise if we are to be secure against the military spirit in our own borders and to help restore and heal the sick and wounded peoples of the world.

We deplore the tendency in certain quarters to build up material for war, military equipment, battleships, submarines, factories for making poisonous gases, etc., all of which foster and encourage the very spirit which has made Prussian militarism a byword and a shaking of the head among the nations.

We all want peace, but for that we need to get rid of the war mind—of the mind which relies on force rather than on good will, on the mailed fist rather than the shield of Christian faith.

Therefore we ask our President and his Cabinet to lead us all toward the goal of these ideals. We love our country, and we wish to help in building it up and in making it a power for righteousness. The door is open; let us enter in and work.

Be assured of our cordial sympathy, of our earnest desire to be useful and loyal citizens. In all this we ask help from God.

Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain.

The President in reply registered his sympathy with their desire, but said that so long as other great nations were planning and executing programs for possible war the United States could not at this hour take up the question of disarmament.

WOMEN ORGANIZING

At the meeting of the Wisconsin Women's Progressive Association the following resolution relative to militarism was passed recently:

Whereas the last Congress appropriated \$3,694,075,363, or 88.6 per cent of the total appropriations, for naval and military purposes and only \$481,744,726, or 11.4 per cent of the whole, for all other functions of government, such as the development of commerce, agriculture, public welfare, education, science, and research, which are essential to the welfare and prosperity of this country; and

Whereas the maintenance of a large military organization will not only impoverish the people of our country, but lead to the automatic conscription of our boys, and to the perversion of civil occupations for military uses; and

Whereas a lasting peace between nations cannot be secured as long as these nations devote more energy to the science of war and destruction than to the arts of peace and constructive endeavors; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Wisconsin Women's Progressive Association, conceive it to be our duty and the duty of all women devoted to the best interests of their homes and of their country to oppose—

First. All candidates for Congress not pledged to the reduction of appropriations for the maintenance of naval and military establishments.

Second. All candidates for Congress not pledged to a definite demand for a reasonable limitation of armaments.

Third. All legislation favoring universal military training. We are opposed to that form of military preparedness which means a race between nations in the building of armies and navies and in the formal training of our youth in military tactics. We heartily favor that real preparedness for peace which is in itself the best safeguard against war. Such preparedness comes only from the assurance of a physically, morally, and mentally healthy and courageous manhood and womanhood through right living conditions: First, material conditions—fair wages, reasonable hours of labor, healthful recreation, sanitary housing, and decent surroundings; and, second, spiritual conditions—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, democratic government, political and industrial, and democratic education for all. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to local papers and the leading press associations.

In Washington, March 27, at a meeting of the newly organized Women's World Disarmament Committee, held in the National Theater and well attended, Mrs. Florence Kelley, the well-known social-service and labor leader, presided, and Congressman James A. Frear and Senator Borah argued for disarmament. The American Federation of Labor also had a spokesman pledging the support of that organization in any effort to reduce armament and to induce the Government of the United States to call an international conference on the subject.

This Easter Day meeting favorable to peace was one of several held in different States of the Union at the same hour and with the same purpose. Nearly \$1,000 was raised for propaganda purposes at the Washington meeting, and of this General Mills, U. S. A., gave one-tenth.

The will of the meeting was expressed in the resolution passed, asking President Harding to call a conference, and

also voicing the opinion that "pending such a conference, appropriations of Congress for armament be postponed."

Congressman Frear did not hesitate in his speech to intimate that the great munitions manufacturing corporations of this country were back of the unprecedented and inexcusable naval and military bill introduced by the government at the recent session of Congress. Senator Borah does not expect disarmament on land, or see how it is thinkable so long as the Versailles Peace Treaty is the working basis for the nations of Europe; but he does believe that if Great Britain, the United States, and Japan were to agree to meet and disarm proportionately the outlook for diminished burdens of taxation would be better. Security without bankruptcy and use of a strategic moment, when only three nations have navies of any size, to establish the principle of disarmament—these are what the Senator wishes to see brought to pass.

April 6 delegates from this party waited on the President. He stated his sympathy and a policy of "watchful waiting."

OPINIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE CITIZENS

The "Disarmament Number" (March) of the journal *World Friendship*, which is the organ of the American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, contains important answers to questions recently sent out by the editor.

These questions were as follows:

1. Whether the United States should call a conference of the powers to take up the question of simultaneous limitation of armament or proportional disarmament?

2. If this were not possible, do you think the United States itself should lead?

The arguments which are being put up by those who are urging that the United States might lead in disarmament, regardless of what other nations do, are:

(1) That we have no enemies to guard against.

(2) That the other nations will follow our example.

Do you feel that there is any weight in either of these arguments?

Out of eighty replies, only ten were in the negative, and practically all of the persons interrogated desired immediate action leading to a conference of the great powers. On the plan of independent action by the United States there is more difference of opinion, an important minority denying that American leadership would be acknowledged or imitated.

JAPAN AND DISARMAMENT

Vice-Admiral Kato, Japanese Minister of Marine, in an interview with the Associated Press March 25 said:

I regret very much to see sinister propagandists or mischief-makers trying to attribute our naval program to a desire to compete with the United States Navy. Nothing could be more preposterous and absurd than this contention. Needless to say, the Japanese Navy desires the most cordial relations with the United States Navy.

The Japanese Government joined the League of Nations, and in doing so supported the principle of the reduction of armaments. Whenever there is an international conference on armament reduction, I will be only too glad to co-operate honestly with other governments to give effect to this principle.

Although there is a clamor for the restriction of armaments throughout the world, yet, taking into consideration the real international situation and the present status of the naval powers, I do not believe our relatively inferior navy should lead the way in reducing, nor that we should curtail our established plan. If a dependable international agree-

ment comes into being, whereby all naval powers should agree to restrict their naval forces, however, I would be very glad to join to a reasonable extent if a suitable formula could be found. Therefore I do not insist upon the completion of our so-called eight-eight program.

A ROOSEVELTIAN NOTE

The chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Appropriations, Hon. Patrick Kelley, of Michigan, speaking at the launching of a super-dreadnaught, *The Colorado*, at Camden, N. J., March 22, said:

The question of great navies is very largely a question for Great Britain and the United States. If Great Britain and the United States agree to scrap some of their old ships and stop expense on old craft—reduce the size of the navy from the bottom, not from the top—why, when this new program is completed we could afford, in my judgment, to make a proposition to Great Britain for proportionate reduction from the bottom. Then, with the navy that we would have left, all brand new, the most powerful ships of their kind afloat upon the waters of the earth, we would get along first rate.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Theodore Roosevelt, speaking at the same function, said:

Now there are people who, for one reason or another, are talking against the navy, saying at this period the country should disarm. Some of these people are perfectly sincere pacifists, some of them are perfectly sincere fools, and incidentally they are the same thing.

The average person thinks the battle cruiser a type of ship inferior to the battleship. We want a strong navy, our present program completed, a balanced navy, a navy with a high morale, high as it has always been in the past, and a navy that is at all times capable of going into action.

GERMANY AND REPARATIONS

Appeal to League of Nations—United States Backs Allies

Germany, on March 22, replying to the ultimatum of the Allied Reparations Commission demanding that 1,000,000,000 gold marks be paid on that date, declined to do so, and intimated that already she had paid over to the Allies a sum larger than that required by the treaty as due on May 1. It was suggested that a joint commission of experts fix the value of deliveries already made by Germany, the Republic agreeing that if these experts decided that there was a deficit in the amount due, then Germany would begin negotiations with the Reparations Commission regarding the float- ing of a loan abroad.

On the 24th the Reparations Commission called on the allied governments to devise a way of forcing Germany to pay the amount claimed as due. The German note of the 22d was formally acknowledged, but no recognition given to the plan for a conference of experts. The text of the communication follows:

Replying to your letter, the Reparations Commission has the honor to inform you:

Firstly, according to the Treaty of Versailles, the Reparations Commission alone has the right to place a valuation upon the deliveries made by Germany.

Secondly, the Reparations Commission, by the same treaty, is authorized to decide which among the deliveries made up to date may be deducted from the 20,000,000,000 gold marks referred to in article 235.

Thirdly, neither paragraphs 9 nor 10, annex 2, part 8, con-

cern an eventual hearing of the German Government concerning Germany's capacity for payment.

There is nothing in the Treaty of Versailles which obliges the commission to hear the German Government upon the conditions under which deliveries to make up the 20,000,000,000 marks mentioned in article 235 should be made or appraised.

Waited as Long as Possible

The commission has awaited as long as possible, thinking the German Government would take the necessary measures faithfully to fulfill its obligations under article 235. It now is persuaded such is not the case. The commission demanded payment of 1,000,000,000 gold marks because of the certainty that Germany possessed the sufficient funds to make immediate payment.

Anxious to execute the treaty in a spirit of fairness, the commission did not fail to add that after the 1,000,000,000 gold marks had been paid it would be ready to discuss any further propositions which might be presented by the German Government before April 1, with the view of partly substituting for gold and foreign securities goods, merchandise, or the proceeds of a foreign loan.

Cannot Accept Bonds

We cannot agree with the German Government that in the event of the 20,000,000,000 marks remaining unpaid on May 1 the balance may be settled by the delivery of the German bonds provided for in paragraph 12. The 20,000,000,000 gold marks in article 235 in no way can be confused with the 20,000,000,000 gold marks representing the amount of the first issue of bonds referred to in paragraph 12 of annex 2. The 20,000,000,000 marks in bonds of annex 2 are simply an acknowledgment of debt to be deducted from the reparations general account.

The 20,000,000,000 gold marks of article 235 must be paid in cash, securities, or the equivalent and be used partly, first, to defray the cost of the armies of occupation and the revictualing of Germany in foodstuffs and raw material, what balance being left to be applied to reparations.

The dispositions of annex 2, paragraph 12, concerning the issue of new bonds, in no way modifies the absolute obligation taken by Germany to pay the 20,000,000,000 marks under article 235. In any event, the total amount of 20,000,000,000 marks gold under article 235 must be paid before May 1. The text is imperative and nonfulfillment of this article, as in any other failure of Germany to fulfill her obligations, would entail penalties.

The above fact being stated, there results that the German Government, by replying negatively to the commission's request that it execute the stipulations of article 235, and especially by refusing to make the payment of 1,000,000,000 marks gold due March 23, must be considered in default of fulfilling its obligations and undertakings. Consequently the commission has decided, in conformity with paragraph 17, annex 2, part 8, of the Versailles Treaty, immediately to call the attention to such default of each of the interested powers.

DUBOIS, *President.*

GERMANY APPEALS TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Germany's appeal to the League of Nations against the terms imposed in the Allies' latest reparation demands was based on terms found in the treaty by the German representatives, which, they say, are now being departed from by the Allies, and constitute in themselves an unwarrantable violation of peace. Further, Germany, to be more specific in her criticism, affirms in substance:

1. Regarding the occupation of three towns on the Rhine, Germany points out that, by article 429, evacuation can only be delayed if the Allies are afraid of unprovoked aggression by Germany; further, provision only is made for reoccupation of the territory previously evacuated.

2. Regarding the economic measures, Germany urges that the British, Belgian, and Italian governments had promised